

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

JASPAL SINGH WALIA,

Plaintiff,

v.

SEATTLE GOODWILL, *et al.*,

Defendants.

No. C07-1251RSL

ORDER REFERRING MOTION TO
SCREENING COMMITTEE AND
STAYING CASE MANAGEMENT
DEADLINES

This matter comes before the Court on plaintiff's objections to the decision of the Honorable Monica J. Benton, United States Magistrate Judge, denying appointment of counsel in the above-captioned case (Dkt. # 23) and his motion to stay all pending case management deadlines (Dkt. # 24). Contrary to defendants' argument, plaintiff's objections are properly before this Court pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a).

On August 13, 2007, plaintiff filed a *pro se* complaint in this Court pursuant to Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Dkt. # 1. Unlike indigent defendants in criminal cases, civil litigants have no constitutional right to counsel at the expense of another. Although the judiciary will sometimes request that members of the bar assist Title VII plaintiffs, it does so only when presented with "such circumstances as the court may deem just." 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-5(f)(1). When determining whether to appoint counsel, the courts of the Ninth Circuit generally consider whether the litigant has the resources to pursue the case, whether the litigant has made

ORDER REFERRING MOTION TO
SCREENING COMMITTEE

1 efforts to obtain counsel on his or her own, and whether there is a colorable claim. Bradshaw v.
2 Zoological Society of San Diego, 662 F.2d 1301, 1318 (9th Cir. 1981).

3 The Court, having considered plaintiff's motion (Dkt. # 2), Magistrate Judge
4 Benton's Order Denying Motion for Appointed Counsel (Dkt. # 21), and the remainder of the
5 record, directs that this matter be referred to the screening panel of the pro bono counsel for
6 possible appointment of counsel to represent plaintiff. Accordingly, pursuant to the Western
7 District of Washington General Order re: Representation of *pro se* Litigants in Civil Rights
8 Cases, the Clerk of the Court is directed to refer the motion for appointment of counsel, the
9 pleadings filed to date, and this Order to the Screening Committee. The Screening Committee is
10 requested to make a recommendation regarding appointment of counsel to the undersigned at its
11 earliest possible convenience.

12 The deadlines set forth in the Court's order of January 29, 2008, are hereby
13 stricken.

14 Dated this 4th day of March, 2008.

15
16 

17 Robert S. Lasnik
18 United States District Judge
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26